

did the Internet come from? It came from and was borne by taxpayers' dollars, out of the national defense budget. It spread far beyond that at this time, and I certainly say and emphasize once again, I am a strong supporter of the Internet, the information superhighway. But for a long, long time, beginning seriously a little over a year ago, I began to develop legislation that would hopefully make the information superhighway a safer highway for kids and families to travel. The legislation that was passed by the Senate on a 86 to 14 vote within the last week or so was a follow-on to a proposal that I addressed and attached to the telecommunications bill out of the Commerce Committee last year.

The concept of all of these has been to make a constructive suggestion, recognizing constitutional rights. Like that portion referred to by the Senator from Iowa, the measure crafted by myself and Senator COATS and our staffs, with the help of an awful lot of people, does provide protection, constitutional guarantees oftentimes supported by the courts in a whole series of areas including the laws that we have always had regarding obscenity on the telephone lines and also laws similarly against transportation of pornographic and obscene materials through the U.S. mail. Further, our law incorporates the protections under the first amendment that have been argued out and thoroughly discussed and held by the courts under the Dial-a-Porn statutes, which is another form of pornography.

It is safe to say, the issue has been engaged. I think that is for the good. Once again, I cannot speak for my cosponsor, Senator COATS, or any cosponsor of the measure that passed the Senate, but this Senator simply says I am willing to listen to any improvements or changes that should be made in this bill. But I certainly am not going to stand by and see it watered down to the place where it is totally meaningless.

Therefore, I say I think we have accomplished a great deal by clearly, for the first time, illuminating and bringing this to the attention of parents of the United States of America. And parents still are required, I suggest, to play a key role in how we develop this and how it is administered. But the parents, I think, cannot do it alone. Therefore, I hope we can continue to work together in a constructive fashion and not listen to the voices that simply say, "I want what I want when I want it on the Internet and I don't care what ill effect that might have on kids."

We have to continue to work together. I hope there is a way to solve this problem for the good of all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

The Senator from New Mexico is advised we have 1 more minute remaining in morning business.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to

speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SCIENCE EDUCATION

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to speak for a few minutes here this morning to oppose cuts for science education that were made June 20, in the House Appropriations Committee, related to the Energy Department. Congress is engaged in an important process to reduce the Federal budget and I support that process. I recognize very difficult choices will have to be made. But I want to be sure, to the extent I can, that the process remains thoughtful and maintains our national commitment to improvement in education and our national investment in education, at the same time that we proceed toward a balanced budget. Cuts being proposed for science education in the Department of Energy appropriation do not meet that test of thoughtfulness and support for investment in education.

In 1989, President Bush met with the 50 Governors throughout this country in an education summit in Charlottesville, VA. That was a historic occasion because for the first time the Governors and the President met together to discuss that important issue of how to improve education in the country.

In 1990, they published goals for this country, and one of those goals, which I believe was an extremely important goal for us to commit ourselves to, was the goal of making this country first in the world in math and science education by the year 2000. This is the backdrop against which we need to judge what we are doing in this appropriations process here in the Congress in these weeks.

I am told that the House appropriations bill, that I referred to before, significantly reduces the \$160 million for science education embedded in various parts of the Department of Energy, and it eliminates altogether the funding for two line items which are focused entirely on education. Those two line items are:

First, the University and Science Education Program in the Department of Energy Office of Science Education and Technical Information. The House appropriations mark for this program has reduced the funding from the proposed \$55 million, which the President asked for in his budget, to absolutely zero.

The second of these two line items is the Department of Energy Technology Transfer and Education Program for Department of Energy Office of Defense Programs. The House mark for this program was reduced from \$249 million in fiscal year 1996—that was the proposed level—to \$15 million, including a cut to zero funding for the \$20 million line item earmarked for science education at our three national weapons laboratories.

Obviously, Mr. President, this is of concern to me because this directly affects two of those national laboratories in my home State of New Mexico, Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories.

First, let me describe the impact of the elimination of the Science Education and Technical Information Program. This cut eliminates the central coordinating and evaluation mechanism for all of the Department of Energy education activities, which is the Office of Science Education and Technical Information. In eliminating this office, Congress would eliminate the administrative infrastructure for other Department of Energy science education offices' programs, the only Department of Energy office in which education is not just an ancillary function.

In addition, this cut would eliminate the laboratory cooperative science centers, which leverage the much larger investment in science and technology expertise residing in the Department of Energy Laboratory System. These centers connect thousands of students and teachers each year in high schools, colleges, and graduate programs with scientists at our Department of Energy laboratories. The centers provide training and mentoring, and hands-on laboratory experiences both at the laboratories themselves and at local public schools and universities. They provide internships, faculty research opportunities, and professional development enhancements and lab-school partnerships. They also help support the Department of Energy's scientists' participation in a variety of State and local systemic education reform activities, such as the National Science Foundation's State systemic reform initiatives.

These cuts will weaken the pipeline of well-trained scientists supported by the 73 percent of programs funds that go to universities to train future engineers, technicians, and scientists for current and future work force needs. They will eliminate Department of Energy work to support and strengthen the caliber of science and math education at the secondary and at the college levels, and the 1996 priorities for work force development, systemic education reform, science literacy, evaluation, and dissemination.

Mr. President, the Department of Energy education cuts will have a particularly damaging effect for those who benefit from the education activities of Sandia National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory in my home State of New Mexico.

First, they will suffer education cuts as part of the centers that I just described. Second, they will also suffer the loss of their part of the additional \$20 million for education programs concentrated at Sandia, Los Alamos, and at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, the Nation's three weapons laboratories.

For Sandia National Laboratory, this would eliminate education outreach funding which in 1995 was \$6 million from the Office of Defense Programs, \$2.3 million from the Office of Science Education, and almost \$2 million from other internal funds to reach a total of over \$10 million.

This will mean the loss of K through 12 student enrichment programs, K through 12 teacher professional development programs, college and university programs, and programs for educational technology.

For Los Alamos National Laboratory, it would eliminate educational outreach funding again for the 1995 fiscal year, which amounted to \$6.3 million from the Office of Defense Programs, \$1.3 million from the Office of Science Education, \$600,000 from other parts of the Office of Energy Research, for a total of about \$8 million.

This would mean the loss of nationally recognized model science and math programs relied upon by the States that they serve for high-quality professional development for our teachers.

Together, these cuts in the two programs will hurt science education in the country, and it will especially hurt science education in my home State of New Mexico. They will weaken the infrastructure support for science education and work force preparation. These are the kinds of priorities that we need to protect. We need to reassert our commitment to reaching the education goals that were established by President Bush and the Governors in 1989. We should not undermine those goals by making these kinds of short-sighted cuts.

Mr. President, as we work to reach deficit reduction and to reach a balanced budget, we need to make our priorities clear. One of our priorities needs to be retaining funding for science and math education. I hope that when the Senate passes its appropriations bill, it will see to it that the funds for these programs are retained, and that we can prevail in conference with the House.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I want to take a moment or two to respond to something that was said earlier in morning business when the Senator from North Dakota gave his usual eloquent discourse on populism, and the fact that he used phrases that Republicans have a philosophy where the rich are paid too little and the poor are paid too much. That was in reference to a budget that will eliminate the deficit by the year 2002.

It is always difficult to stand on the floor and defend an effort to really do something about the deficit because those individuals who want to continue the social programs, who want to continue business as usual, will stand up and make it look as if those of us who are trying to be fiscally responsible, those of us who recognize that it is not any of us in this Chamber but future generations that are going to have to pay for all of this fun we are having right now, that somehow we are not acting responsibly. I think the elections of November 8, 1994, were very clear warning signals that we are going to change, we are not going to have business as usual in America.

But the thing that disturbed me more than anything else that was said by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], was the reference to a national defense system, national missile defense system, star wars. This is the first warning sign that I have heard in this cycle that we are going to have in fact opposition, people wanting to make it look like those of us who want to have a national missile defense system, somehow we are looking up in the stars in a Buck Rogers kind of syndrome, that it is something that is very expensive and something we cannot have.

I would like to suggest, Mr. President, that we have an opportunity to prepare now to defend ourselves against a future national missile attack. It was not long ago that Jim Woolsey, who was the chief security adviser to the President of the United States, President Clinton, made the observation that our intelligence informs us that there are between 20 and 25 countries that either have or are developing weapons of mass destruction—either nuclear, chemical, or biological—and are developing the missile, the means of delivering those warheads.

This is a very frightening thing, when we stop and realize that we in America do not have a missile defense system. Most people think we do have it somehow, but we do not.

Many of us can remember what happened back in 1972 when the ABM Treaty was agreed to, that back in 1972 it was a treaty predicated on the assumption that there were two superpowers in the world, the Soviet Union and the United States. I suggest, Mr. President, that there are many of us who believe that the threat out there to the United States security could be greater now than it was back then because at least then we could identify who the enemy was. And now, as Jim Woolsey said, there is a proliferation, a number of countries that have this technology, and many countries that have already demonstrated they are not friends of United States are getting a missile system to deliver warheads.

So I believe that we must be very cautious and not use the normal populace, partisan patter that you hear around this Chamber so much when people start talking about star wars. It

is not star wars. We have an ability—and we demonstrated that we are going to use the current Aegis system that we have a \$50 billion investment in—to have a high-tier missile defense system that we will be desperately needing in the very near system.

So I hope my colleagues will refrain from taking political advantage of the situation we are in by not saying exactly what it is, and that is that there is a threat out there and the United States of America does not have a national missile defense system.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today is the 50th anniversary of the signing of the U.N. Charter. Amid high hopes at the end of the Second World War in Europe, the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco. Fifty years later, the record of the United Nations is mixed, and the expectations of its founders have not been met.

The United Nations has had some important accomplishments—on international air travel, eradicating smallpox, and sharing information about global concerns ranging from weather to health. But the United Nations at 50 is an organization at a crossroads—if the United Nations is to survive another 50 years, there must be fundamental change. If the United Nations is to be more than a debating society with 185 members, there must be fundamental change. And if the United Nations is ever to fulfill the hopes of its founders, there must be fundamental change.

Much was written this last weekend about the past and future of the United Nations. In my view, the best single piece was by Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM and Congressman LEE HAMILTON—one a Republican and the other a Democrat, I might add. On each of the key issues facing the United Nations, they made important points.

On peacekeeping, they conclude the United Nations has overreached. Much criticism of the United Nations in the last 5 years has centered on the failures of U.N. peacekeeping. The tragic record of Somalia and Bosnia make one fact very clear—the United Nations is not capable of mounting serious military operations. Nor should it be. Monitoring an agreement between two or more parties is one thing the United Nations can do. Imposing an agreement is something it cannot. The United Nations should be limited to peacekeeping, not peace enforcing.

Senator KASSEBAUM and Congressman HAMILTON also suggested the United Nations focus on key agencies and functions—such as the International Atomic Energy Agency—and quit wasting time and money on the dozens of agencies which no longer serve a useful purpose—if they ever did. In my view